

NITIN GAMBHIR (SBN 259906)  
ngambhir@polsinelli.com  
POLSINELLI LLP  
1661 Page Mill Road, Suite A  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
T: 650-461-7700  
F: 650-461-7701

DANIEL D. OWEN (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
dowen@polsinelli.com  
G. GABRIEL ZOROGASTUA (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
gzorogastua@polsinelli.com  
ALEXA R. DICUNZOLO (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
adicunzolo@polsinelli.com  
POLSINELLI PC  
900 w. 48<sup>TH</sup> Place, Ste. 900  
Kansas City, MO 64112  
T: 816-753-1000  
F: 816-753-1536

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
TEVRA BRANDS, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

TEVRA BRANDS, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

BAYER HEALTHCARE LLC, and  
BAYER ANIMAL HEALTH GmbH, and  
BAYER AG,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-cv-04312-BLF

**PLAINTIFF TEVRA BRANDS, LLC'S  
SUR-REPLY IN OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS BAYER HEALTHCARE  
LLC'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR  
FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

Date: February 27, 2020  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Cttrm: 3, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Honorable Beth Labson Freeman

**REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**

1 Bayer's fourteen purported agreements with retailers and distributors (Exhibits 1–14 to  
 2 Bayer's Request for Judicial Notice, ECF No. 43 ("RJN")) (collectively, the "New Exhibits") are  
 3 not incorporated into the Complaint, nor subject to judicial notice. Even if they were, the New  
 4 Exhibits support Tevra's allegations of tying and exclusive dealing, because [REDACTED]  
 5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED]  
 7 [REDACTED] These contract terms, along with Bayer's  
 8 extensive rebate programs, make the contracts *de facto* exclusive dealing agreements. Their  
 9 practical effect is to require retailers to exclusively purchase and promote Bayer's imidacloprid  
 10 products if they want to buy Seresto. Because "Seresto is a 'must have' product for Pet Specialty  
 11 Retailers and Online Retailers" (Compl. ¶ 73), the New Exhibits show why retailers cannot  
 12 easily terminate their Bayer contracts. Bayer's Motion to Dismiss should be denied.

13 **A. The New Exhibits support Tevra's tying and exclusive dealing claims.**

14 The New Exhibits contain [REDACTED] For example, the [REDACTED]  
 15 [REDACTED]  
 16 [REDACTED]  
 17 [REDACTED] RJN Ex. 3 at BAH 67, 70. [REDACTED]  
 18 [REDACTED]  
 19 [REDACTED] *Id.* at BAH 64, 67. RJN Exhibits 2 & 4–9 [REDACTED]

20 The New Exhibits also show how Bayer's rebates force retailers to buy Bayer's  
 21 imidacloprid exclusively. [REDACTED]  
 22 [REDACTED]  
 23 [REDACTED]  
 24 [REDACTED]  
 25 [REDACTED]  
 26 [REDACTED] RJN Ex. 3 at BAH 67–68. These conditions convinced retailers they  
 27 cannot buy imidacloprid from anyone else because they cannot afford to lose the Seresto rebates.  
 28

**B. The New Exhibits show that Bayer's agreements are not easily terminable.**

Bayer claims the New Exhibits show its agreements are easily terminable, so they cannot foreclose substantial competition. This assumes the simple insertion of a termination clause into a tying and exclusive dealing agreement prevents any substantial lessening of competition. This assumption is unfounded. The Court must evaluate the economic impact of the entire contract, not just a single term. The Complaint alleges that the economic impact of Bayer's contracts is that no pet specialty retailer will terminate its Bayer contract to switch to Tevra's product.

The New Exhibits show one reason why not: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] a must-have product for pet specialty retailers.

Compl. ¶¶ 4, 73. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] But even if (contrary to the Complaint's allegations) Bayer were willing to sell Seresto at the regular wholesale price to a retailer whose contract was terminated, the discounts lost would make it unprofitable to the retailer. Compl. ¶ 128. For example, discounts in [REDACTED] contract (Ex. 3) include, but are not limited to:

Discount & Percentage	Requirements
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] *Id.* at BAH 60. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] *Id.* Applying the potential

1 [REDACTED] discount to the [REDACTED] would lose [REDACTED] in discounts  
 2 if it terminated its tying and exclusive dealing agreement with Bayer.

3 Prior versions of the [REDACTED] agreement contain additional anti-competitive provisions  
 4 that [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED] RJN Ex. 2 at BAH 49 ¶

6 4.b. [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED] *Id.* at BAH 49 ¶ 6. Additionally, around the same time  
 8 manufacturers of generic imidacloprid attempted to enter the market, [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] (*Id.* at BAH 55 ¶ 5), [REDACTED] e

10 [REDACTED] *Compare id.* at BAH 55 ¶ 5 with RJN Ex. 3 at BAH 68 ¶ 5.

11 Bayer's other agreements contain similar anti-competitive provisions. For example, the  
 12 agreements with [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]  
 14 [REDACTED] RJN Ex. 4 at BAH 80–81; Ex. 5 at BAH 92–93; Ex. 6  
 15 at BAH 103–05; Ex. 7 at BAH 115–16; Ex. 12 at BAH 229–34. [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]  
 17 [REDACTED] RJN Ex. 11 at BAH

18 175-80. Accordingly, the New Exhibits support Tevra's allegation that Bayer's discounts  
 19 effectively preclude retailers from buying generic imidacloprid, as retailers risk losing millions  
 20 of dollars in discounts from Bayer if they do business with Bayer's competitors. Compl. ¶ 125.

21 For the reasons stated here and in its Response and prior briefs, Tevra respectfully  
 22 requests the Court not consider Bayer's New Exhibits at all, much less for the truth of the matters  
 23 asserted therein. ECF No. 35 at 1–3, 16 & ECF No. 46. However, if the Court does consider  
 24 them, they strongly support the Complaint's allegations. Bayer's Motion should be denied.

1 Dated: January 17, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

2 POLSINELLI LLP

3  
4 By: /s/ Alexa R. DiCunzolo  
Alexa R. DiCunzolo

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
6 TEVRA BRANDS, LLC  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28